

Remarks

This is in response to the final Office Action mailed December 30, 2004. Claims 1-6, 10-29, 33-39, 43-52, 56-61, and 65-68 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

In Section 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 10-29, 33-39, 43-52, 56-61, and 65-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishizuka et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,313,635, in view of Woolsey et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,029,000, and further in view of Liu, U.S. Patent No. 6,058,482. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of offloading compilation. Claim 1 recites, among other limitations, detecting whether first and second subsystems are connected via a secure link to determine if the second subsystem is a trusted source using a receipt policy. An advantage of connecting the first and second subsystems using a secure link is that the first subsystem can ensure that the machine-executable code has not been tampered with when it is received from the second subsystem. See, for example, Application, p. 9, ll. 4-6. Another advantage of using a secure link is that the first subsystem can be simplified in construction. See, for example, Application, p. 15, ll. 14-18 (noting that detect module 414 and query operation 416 are optional if security is provided by a secure link rather than through other security techniques such as a digital signature).

The rejection concedes that neither Ishizuka nor Woolsey discloses detecting whether first and second subsystems are connected via a secure link, as recited in claim 1. Liu likewise fails to disclose or suggest detecting whether first and second subsystems are connected via a secure link for at least the following reasons.

Liu discloses a system in which a keyword is associated with downloadable executable code to provide network security. Specifically, when a user requests information from a server, the server receives the request and associates keywords with executables that can be downloaded. When the user selects to invoke such an executable, the user transmits a request including the keyword to the server. The server then transmits the executable code designated by the keyword to the user. In this manner, the likelihood that the downloaded code is spoofed or imitated by a locally stored rogue program is reduced. Liu, col. 3, l. 7 - col. 4, l. 3; and col. 9, l.

63 - col. 10, l. 22. The keyword disclosed by Liu consequently functions in a manner similar to that of an automated or embedded password.

However, Liu fails to disclose or suggest a secure link. Liu therefore fails to disclose or suggest detecting whether first and second subsystems are connected via a secure link, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, no combination of Ishizuka, Woolsey, and Liu will result in a method including detecting whether first and second subsystems are connected via a secure link to determine if the second subsystem is a trusted source using a receipt policy, as recited by claim 1.

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, as well as claims 2-6 and 10-18 that depend therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.


Independent claims 19, 27, 34, 48, and 56 all include subject matter similar to that identified above in claim 1. Therefore, claims 19, 27, 34, 48, and 56, as well as claims 20-26, 28, 29, 33, 35-39, 43-47, 49-52, 57-61, and 65-68 that depend respectively therefrom, are allowable for at least similar reasons to those provided above for claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 19-29, 33-39, 43-52, 56-61, and 65-68 are respectfully requested.

The remarks set forth above provide certain arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claims. There may be other reasons that the pending claims are patentably distinct over the cited references, and the right to raise any such other reasons or arguments in the future is expressly reserved.

In view of the above, it is submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: February 1, 2005


Name: Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No.: 50,471
RAK